

Remarks/Arguments:

The Examiner has objected to the Specification because the Abstract was not on a separate sheet. Applicant has accordingly amended the Specification to include the Abstract on its own page.

The Examiner also rejected Claim 21 under 35 USC 112, as the Markush group recited in Claim 21 was inconsistent with the amended recitations in Claim 1. Applicant has canceled claim 21 making this rejection moot.

The Examiner has also rejected claims 1, 3-9, 11, 13-22 and 24-28 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Chum et al (US 5,677,383) in view of Bamburger et al (US 6,384,158). The Examiner points out that Chum does not teach that the composition may be blended with LDPE, and then suggests that "Bamburger teaches that it is common practice to add low levels of LDPE to a linear polyethylene in order to increase its melt index." Initially, it should be pointed out, that higher melt strength is not a universally desired characteristic. Thus, it is not clear from the art cited by the Examiner why a person of ordinary skill in the art would seek to increase the melt strength of the blends in Chum.

Secondly, it is also generally known that the addition of LDPE leads to a decrease in other properties such as heat sealing properties or toughness. Accordingly, even if higher melt strength was desired, it is not clear that a person of ordinary skill would add LDPE to the blend of Chum.

More importantly, however, even if a person of ordinary skill did want to increase melt strength by adding LDPE, it is clear from Bamgarner that he would not add LDPE in the amount recited in the claims (i.e., 20 to 40 percent by weight), as Bamgarner indicates that only "low levels" of LDPE are to be added. Accordingly, even if the blends in Chum were perceived as lacking melt strength, a person of ordinary skill in the art, understanding the deficiencies associated with LDPE would probably not add LDPE at all, but clearly would not add it in the amounts recited in the present claims.

Therefore, as the recitation in the present claims are not suggested by the combination of references taught by the Examiner, the Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection and issue a notice of allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

Electronic Signature for James T. Hoppe: /James T. Hoppe/
James T. Hoppe
Registration No. 35,899
Phone: 979-238-9039

P. O. Box 1967
Midland, MI 48641-1967
smm